

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,712	06/23/2003	Michael Francis Dube	14150-00601	5751
25243	7590 10/24/2005		EXAMINER	
COLLIER SHANNON SCOTT, PLLC			MAYES, DIONNE WALLS	
3050 K STREET, NW SUITE 400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			1731	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		,			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/600,712	DUBE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Dionne Walls Mayes	1731			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period way a reply reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Section 2	eptember 2005.				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-10,13,15-18,21-30,33,35-37,40,4 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-10,15-17,21-26,29,30,36,41,4 7) ☐ Claim(s) 6,13,18,27,28,33,35,37,40,47 and 58 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration. 14,45,48-57,59 and 60 is/are rejections/ is/are objected to.				
Application Papers	•				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	* , ,	• •			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/600,712

Art Unit: 1731

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Re-opening of Prosecution/Withdrawal of Previously Indicated Allowable Subject Matter

After updating the prior art search, the Examiner has determined that a new ground of rejection should be made over the claims, as filed on September 21, 2005, in view of the Berger '306 and Dock references. Therefore, the FINALITY of the rejection of the last Office Action, dated June 28, 2005, and the indication of allowable subject matter has been WITHDRAWN. In view of the discovery of the above-cited art, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED as set forth below.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 23- 26, 29-30, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dock (US. Pat. No. 3,625,228).

Dock discloses all that is recited in the claims since it shows a tobacco rod(!7); a first filter segment (11) connected to the tobacco rod; a cavity (15); a second filter segment (12), and at least one breakable capsule (13) disposed in the cavity. Also included is a longitudinally extending central portion (16) and a longitudinally extending outer portion of the filter material positioned annularly around the central portion (see entire document and figs.)

Application/Control Number: 10/600,712 Page 3

Art Unit: 1731

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 15-17, 21-22, 41, 44-45, 48-57, and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger '306 (US. Pat. No. 3,994,306) in view of Berger '646 (US. Pat. No. 3,599,646) and Dock (US. Pat. No. 3,625,228).
- 3. Berger '306 discloses, as most clearly evident from Figs. 1 and 6, nearly all that is recited in the claims since it teaches a cigarette comprising a tobacco rod (22); a filter element (24), said filter element incorporating an outer element of filter material (32, 24 or 32b, 34b), and an inner element of filter material (40,42); a cavity (44b) defined by the inner element of filter material (which extends from the proximal end of the filter element) (see Fig. 1); and smoke-modifying material which occupies said cavity (see entire reference, but specifically col. 4, lines 14-36). While Berger '306 may not specifically state that the smoke-modifying material is at least one breakable capsule, Berger '646 (which discloses a cigarette filter having a very similar structure to that of Berger '306) discloses that material for flavoring smoke can be added to the cavity created by the inner element of filter material (See col. 2, lines 54-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 1731

invention to have incorporated a flavoring material into the cavity of Berger '306 since both filters are designed similarly and for the same purpose. Further, Dock discloses heat-activated capsules, appearing to be the claimed sizes, that rupture upon exposure to heat and are designed to be disposed within cigarette filters to deliver flavorants to the user during the smoking of the cigarette (see cols. 1 and 2, and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated one or more of these capsules into the cavity of the filter of the combined Berger references in order to receive the benefit of heat-activated capsules for imparting much-desired flavor, i.e. menthol, to cigarette smoke.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6, 13, 18, 27-28, 33, 35, 37, 40, 47, and 58 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - Berger '063 (US. Pat. No. 4,046,063)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dionne Walls Mayes whose telephone number is (571) 272-1195. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7AM - 4:30PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/600,712

Art Unit: 1731

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on (571) 272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dionne Walls Mayes Primary Examiner Art Unit 1731 Page 5

October 20, 2005